

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-20 and 22-26 are currently pending
- Claims 4-13, 16-18, and 23-25 are canceled herein
- Claims 1, 14, 15, 19, 20, 22, and 26 are amended herein

[0003] Support for the amendments to the claims is found in the specification at least in paragraph 35, 39, and 40 and in Tables 1 and 2.

Claim Objections

[0004] Claims 10-19 stand objected to as depending from claim 0. In response, Applicant notes that claims 10-13 and 16-18 are cancelled, thus obviating their rejections. Claim 14 is independent, and thus does not depend from claim 0 or any other claim. Claims 15 and 19 have been amended to depend from claim 14.

Cited Documents

[0005] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Bokor: Jonathan Bokor et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0015998

- Addington: Timothy H. Addington et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0025181
- Westrick: Kelley A. Westrick, U.S. Patent No. 7,165,264
- Carlucci: John B. Carlucci et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0015999
- Eyal: Full Reference Name, U.S. Patent No. 6,484,199
- Barrus: John Barrus et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0022122
- MacInnis: Alexander G. MacInnis, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028899

Claims 1-4 and 22 Are Non-Obvious Over Bokor In View Of Addington In View Of Westrick In Further View Carlucci

[0006] Claims 1-4 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Bokor in view of Addington in view of Westrick in further view Carlucci. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0007] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is moot. Specifically, the cited references do not teach or suggest the claimed:

receiving, by head-end equipment from a content provider, a digital television (DTV) application and its associated metadata, wherein the receiving is facilitated by an extended asset definition interface, the extended asset definition

interface specifying a data structure including the DTV application and metadata attributes consisting of:

- an application identifier field for identifying the DTV application;

- an originator identifier field for identifying an originator of the DTV application;

- an application-type field for indicating a type of the DTV application;

- a profile field for indicating a minimum profile of a system on which the DTV application will execute;

- a visibility field for indicating the degree of control a user has over the DTV application;

- a permission field for denoting “sandbox” security permission of the DTV application; and

- a rating field for indicating a rating of the DTV application;

- generating, by the head-end equipment, a content referencing identifier for the DTV application;

- registering, by the head-end equipment, an authority record with an authority to enable the DTV receiving unit to resolve the content referencing identifier;

[0008] In rejecting claim 1, which previously recited only an “asset definition interface”, the Examiner cited Addington, which mentions CableLabs’ asset definition interface (ADI) for video-on-demand objects. Applicant also recognized CableLabs’ ADI in paragraphs 4 and 5 of Applicant’s Specification.

[0009] As amended, however, claim 1 recites an *extended* ADI. As acknowledged by Applicant in paragraph 7, CableLab's ADI does not fully capture the necessary metadata for objects other than video-on-demand object. Thus, Applicant defines an extended ADI (EADI) to specify the necessary metadata for managed applications and other types of content. Applicant's EADI is described at least in paragraphs 39 and 40 and Tables 1 and 2 of Applicant's Specification. Applicant respectfully submits that the EADI defined in these portions of the Specification is patentably distinct from the ADI of CableLabs mentioned in Addington.

[0010] While not necessary to distinguish the EADI of claim 1 from the ADI of Addington, Applicant has nonetheless added the fields specified in Table 2 of Applicant's Specification to claim 1 to capture the scope of the EADI in claim 1. As the Examiner will note, some of these fields were previously mentioned as portions of metadata in now cancelled claim 8. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that those fields were simply described as fields of a data structure containing metadata, not as fields specified by an EADI.

[0011] Applicant further submits that the EADI claimed in amended claim 1 is not obvious in view of the combined references and that no teaching or suggestion of the EADI is to be found in the cited references or in the knowledge of those of skill in the art at the time of the invention. The only application on the record which discusses and EADI is the Applicant's Specification. And any use of the Applicant's specification in arriving at a conclusion of obviousness is not permissible, as it inherently relies on impermissible hindsight.

[0012] In addition to the EADI, amended claim 1 recites “registering, by the head-end equipment, an authority record with an authority to enable the DTV receiving unit to resolve the content referencing identifier.” No mention is made in the cited references of registering an authority record with an authority, much less of “registering, by the head-end equipment, an authority record with an authority *to enable the DTV receiving unit to resolve the content referencing identifier*” (emphasis added). Thus, at least by virtue of this additional recitation, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are overcome.

[0013] Consequently, the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 22

[0014] Claim 22 recites features similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claim 22 is patentable over the cited references.

Dependent Claims 2-4

[0015] Claim 4 is canceled, thus obviating its rejection.

[0016] Claims 2 and 3 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2 and 3 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a

patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

Claims 9-10 Are Non-Obvious Over Bokor In View Of Carlucci

[0017] Claims 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Bokor in view of Carlucci. Claims 9 and 10 are cancelled, thus obviating their rejections.

Claims 14-17 Are Non-Obvious Over Bokor In View Of Westrick In Further In View Of Carlucci

[0018] Claims 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Bokor in view of Westrick in further in view of Carlucci. In response, Applicant has amended the claims, thus overcoming the Examiner's rejections.

[0019] Claim 14 recites features similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claim 14 is patentable over the cited references

[0020] Claims 16 and 17 are canceled, thus obviating their rejections.

[0021] Claim 15 ultimately depends from independent claim 14. As discussed above, claim 14 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 15 is also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on a patentable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be patentable for the additional features that it recites.

Claims 5-7, 11, 12, 18, 19, and 23-25 Are Non-Obvious Over Bokor In View Of Addington In View Of Westrick In View Of Carlucci And Further In View Of Eyal

[0022] Claims 5-7, 11, 12, 18, 19, and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Bokor in view of Addington in view of Westrick in view of Carlucci and further in view of Eyal.

[0023] Claims 5-7, 11, 12, 18, and 23-25 are canceled, thus obviating their rejections.

[0024] Claim 19 ultimately depends from independent claim 14. As discussed above, claim 14 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 19 is also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on a patentable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be patentable for the additional features that it recites.

Claim 20 Is Non-Obvious Over Bokor In View Of Addington In View Of Westrick In View Of Carlucci And Further In View Of Eyal

[0025] Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Bokor in view of Addington in view of Westrick in view of Carlucci and further in view of Eyal. In response, Applicant has amended claim 20 to overcome the Examiner's rejections.

[0026] Eyal does not cure the above discussed deficiencies of the other cited references with regard to the recitations of claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is patentable over Bokor, Addington, Westrick, Carlucci, and Eyal.

[0027] Claim 20 includes recitations similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claim 20 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 8, 13, and 26 Are Non-Obvious Over Bokor In View Of Addington In View Of Westrick In View Of Carlucci In View Of Eyal In View Of Barrus In Further View MacInnis

[0028] Claims 8, 13, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Bokor in view of Addington in view of Westrick in view of Carlucci in view of Eyal in view of Barrus in further view MacInnis.

[0029] Eyal, Barrus, and MacInnis do not cure the above discussed deficiencies of the other cited references with regard to the recitations of claims 1 and 22. Thus, Claims 1 and 22 are patentable over Bokor, Addington, Westrick, Carlucci, Eyal, Barrus, and MacInnis.

[0030] Claims 8 and 13 are canceled, thus obviating their rejections.

[0031] Claim 26 ultimately depends from independent claim 22. As discussed above, claim 22 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 26 is also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on a patentable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be patentable for the additional features that it recites

Conclusion

[0032] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/ Dated: 8/6/2009
Robert C. Peck(robpe@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)
Registration No. 56826

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162)
Registration No. 53725